

REMARKS

In this paper, claims 1, 5, 8 and 10 are currently amended. After entry of the above amendment, claims 1-6 and 8-21 are pending, and claim 7 has been canceled.

An Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) accompanies this amendment. If the IDS is not in the PTO file when the examiner considers this amendment, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned so that a duplicate copy may be provided.

The applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 2, 9, 11-15, 20 and 21.


The applicant appreciates the indicated allowability of claims 5, 6, 8, 10 and 16-19 if rewritten in independent form. Claims 5, 8 and 10 have been rewritten to be in independent form, including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, so it is believed that claims 5, 6, 8, 10 and 16-19 are now allowable.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Olson (US 1,526,008). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the mating portion and the spindle mating portion are one piece. Olson discloses a ball bearing comprising an inner race member (10) loosely mounted on a shaft (13). Inner race member (10) has an eccentric outer peripheral groove (14) that supports a split ring (15). A collar (16) is placed on shaft (13) adjacent to inner race member (10). Collar (16) has a flange (18) with an eccentric bore (19) that fits over split ring (15) in the eccentric outer peripheral groove (14) of inner race member (10). Collar (16) is fixed to shaft (13) by a set screw (17). The eccentric coupling between flange (18) and the split ring (15) in outer peripheral groove (14) of inner race member (10) prevents rotation of inner race member (10) relative to shaft (13). Insofar as set screw (17) is interpreted to be a spindle mating portion, it is not one piece with a mating portion of the first lock member. In fact, making set screw (17) one piece with a mating portion of the first lock member would render set screw (17) inoperative. Thus, Olson neither discloses nor suggests the presently claimed subject matter.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 has been overcome by the foregoing amendment and remarks, and it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Deland  
Reg. No. 31,242

DELAND LAW OFFICE  
P.O. Box 69  
Klamath River, California 96050  
(530) 465-2430